

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 29, 2009. Claims 9-11 and 13-15 are pending, of which Claims 9 and 13 are in independent form. Claims 9 and 13 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 9-11 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,774,951 (*Narushima*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 9 and 13, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 is directed to a data broadcasting receiving and reproducing apparatus including a receiving unit, a data obtaining unit, a storing unit, a setting information obtaining unit, and a converting unit. The receiving unit is configured to receive a digital broadcasting wave transmitted from a broadcasting station. The data obtaining unit is for obtaining data broadcasting data including displayable content data and text data described in print permission/inhibition information of the content data and a script program executed based on a broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave transmitted from the broadcasting station. The script program is defined preliminarily correspondingly to the broadcasting event command. The print permission/inhibition information indicates a set value for permission or inhibition of printing the content data. The text data is described by a markup language and the script program is included within the text data described in the markup language. Also, the text data is a function for executing a process to convert the set value of the print

permission/inhibition information. The storing unit is for storing the data broadcasting data obtained by the data obtaining unit. The setting information obtaining unit is for obtaining, from the text data stored in the data storing unit, the print permission/inhibition information of the content data. The converting unit is for converting the set value indicated by the print permission/inhibition information obtained by the data obtaining unit from one permitting the printing the content data into one inhibiting the printing of the content data, or from one inhibiting the printing the content data into one permitting the printing the content data. The converting unit comprises a browser adapted to display the content data by interpreting the text data, the browser converting the set value indicated by the print permission/inhibition information corresponding to the content data obtained by the data obtaining unit and stored in the data storing unit, according to executing the script program corresponding to the broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave.

Among other features of the apparatus of Claim 9 are the data obtaining unit and the converting unit. By virtue of the data obtaining unit data broadcasting data is obtained that includes displayable content data, text data, and a script program. The text data is described in print permission/inhibition information of the content data. The script program is executed based on a broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave transmitted from the broadcasting station, and is defined preliminary correspondingly to the broadcasting event command. The print permission/inhibition information indicates a set value for permission or inhibition of printing the content data. The text data is described by a markup language, and the script program is included within

the text data described in the markup language. Moreover, the script program is a function for executing a process to convert the set value of the print permission/inhibition information.

By virtue of the converting unit, the set value can be converted according to executing the script program corresponding to the broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave. The converting unit is a browser adapted to display the content data by interpreting the text data. The browser can convert the set value from one permitting the printing of the content data into one inhibiting the printing of the content data, or vice versa. Accordingly, because the script program to be executed based on the broadcasting event command is included in the broadcasting data and is transmitted, it is unnecessary to convert printability information, thereby simplifying the structure of the apparatus.

Narushima, as understood by Applicants, relates to a structure for printing content information included in a digital broadcast distribution, the content information being converted by a contents information converter into a form suitable for printing. However, nothing has been found in *Narushima* that is believed to teach or suggest the data obtaining unit and the converting unit claimed in Claim 9.

Page 3, lines 20-22 of the Office Action states “[F]ig. 19 shows a script program. That is, the entire program is a script to be executed by the STB 30. The script information distributed by the digital broadcast is converted by the STB into a script suited to printing.” However, the “script” recited in Claim 9 is included within the text data described in the markup language. Fig. 19 of *Narushima* is merely markup language text,

and does not include, much less constitute, a script program. *Narushima* describes at column 20, line 57, through column 22, line 29, that the HTML information shown in Fig. 19 is merely the result of a conversion of contents information into HTML form suitable for being printed by a converter 68 (contents information conversion unit). At most, the markup language text shown in Fig. 19 of *Narushima* corresponds to markup language text shown in Fig. 4 of the above-identified application, which is used in connection with displaying an image shown in Fig. 5 of the same application. For example, in contrast to the markup language text shown in Fig. 19 of *Narushima*, in Fig. 4A of the above-identified application a script is shown arranged between a line marked "<script language =\"JavaScript\">" and a line marked by "</script>".¹

Moreover, the "script" recited in Claim 9 is a function for executing a process to convert the set value of the print permission/inhibition information. The Office Action asserts at page 3, lines 21 and 22 that the "script information distributed by the digital broadcast is converted by the STB into a script suited to printing." However, Claim 9 refers to converting the set value, not the script, from one inhibiting or permitting the printing of the content data. Thus nothing has been found in the markup language shown in Fig. 19 of *Narushima* that teaches or suggests a script that is a function for executing a process to convert the set value of the print permission/inhibition information.

Narushima also fails to disclose "a broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave transmitted from the broadcasting station", as recited in

^{1/} It is to be understood that the scope of the claims is not limited by the details of this or any other embodiment that may be referred to.

Claim 9. As mentioned above, the broadcasting event command is a command included in the broadcast wave and is transmitted for executing the script program. According to the received broadcast event command, the script program is executed, and, by virtue of the script program, the print permission/inhibition information is converted, for example, from a permission status to an inhibition status. The Office Action asserts that the markup language shown in Fig. 19 of *Narushima* corresponds to both the “script program” (Office Action, page 6, lines 3-5, and page 3, lines 20 and 21) and the “broadcast event command” (Office Action, page 7, lines 11-13). However, by virtue of the features of Claim 9, after receiving the script program, the script program is executed corresponding to the broadcasting event command included in the digital broadcasting wave transmitted from the broadcast station. Therefore, Applicants submit that even if, for the sake of argument, the “script program” and the “broadcast event command” are assumed to be the same, which Applicants submit they are not, there would be an inconsistency in the in the argument in the Office Action. That is, if the markup language in Fig. 19 of *Narushima* is a script program to be executed by the STB30, as asserted in the Office Action, it cannot also be true that that same markup language shown in Fig. 19 is also the broadcasting event command.

The Office Action asserts that “the print permission/inhibition information” of Claim 9 corresponds to the “printer control signal” of *Narushima*. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion because according to *Narushima*, the printer control signal is not a signal described in text data included in data broadcasting data, but is instead a signal transmitted to a printer 32 from a STB 30. That is, in contrast to

Narushima, according to Claim 9, the print permission/inhibition information is not transmitted to the printer, but is described in the text data. According to received broadcasting event, the script program is executed, and the print permission/inhibition information is converted, for example, from a permission status to an inhibition status.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 9 is patentable over *Narushima*.

Independent Claim 13 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 9, and is also believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application depend from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 4567752v1